



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/367,580	08/17/1999	KLAUS GRADISCHNIG	P991527	4526

29177 7590 10/03/2002

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD, LLC
P. O. BOX 1135
CHICAGO, IL 60690-1135

EXAMINER

PHAN, MAN U

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2665

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

h

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/367,580

Applicant(s)

Gradischnig

Examiner

Man Phan

Art Unit

2665

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jun 20, 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 7-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 7, 8, 10, and 11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 9 and 12 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2665

Response to Amendment and argument

1. This communication is in response to applicant's 06/20/2002 Amendment in the application of Gradischnig for "A node which supports enhanced links for transferring longer messages than according to current MTP level 2" filed 08/17/1999. The amendment to the claims has been entered and made of record. Claims 7 and 10 have been amended. Claims 7-12 are pending in the application.

2. Applicant's amendment and argument to the rejected claims are insufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited prior arts or overcome the rejection of said claims under 35 U.S.C.103 as discussed below. Applicants' argument with respect to the rejected claims have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive for at least the following reasons.

3. Applicant's argument with respect to the rejected claims 7, 12 (Page 2, second paragraph) that the cited references do not disclose "*a second point code which is used to identify the node as one having the ability to transfer the long messages*". However, Christie et al. (US#5,926,482) is applied herein merely for the teaching of the converting point codes in a signal transfer point in a telecommunications signaling system. The STP converts point codes (*first and second signaling point codes*) which designate the *origination and destination signaling points for the message (OPC & DPC)*. The conversion is based on information defined by the messages, such as origination or destination information; creates a virtual signaling system which can be

Art Unit: 2665

reconfigured at the STP by converting point codes, and thus, altering the identities of the signaling points (See Fig. 6 and the abstract). Christie discloses an enhanced signal transfer point (STP) which alters the point codes (*first and second signaling point codes*) in telecommunications signaling and supports user parts in addition to providing standard STP functionality. In addition, a broadband point code identifying functions and MTP users is designed to support a longer message length compared to current MTP level 2 (See Fig. 1 and page 2). As is known in the art, MTP Levels 1 and 2 facilitate the transfer of SS7 messages from one point to another over an individual signaling link. Level 3 facilitates the transfer of SS7 messages over the SS7 network beyond the requirements of individual link transmission. In other words, levels 1 and 2 are concerned with transport over individual links whereas level 3 is concerned with transport over the SS7 network in general. An STP accomplishes its routing task at level 3 through the use of point codes (*first and second signaling point codes*) which identify the various signaling points in the network. The STP level 3 will identify the destination point code (DPC) in an SS7 message and select the proper signaling link for routing that message (*second point code which is used to identify the particular node as one which has the ability to transfer the message*). For example, if switch A signals a switch B through an STP, the message will contain the destination point code (*second point code*) for the signaling point in switch B (and the originating point code (*first point code*) for switch A). The STP will accept this signal off of one signaling link, read the destination point code (*second point code*), and place the message on the appropriate link for switch B (See Fig. 8; Col. 1, lines 40 plus). Furthermore, Clarke (US#5,550,914) reference was used for the teaching of the broadband SS7 message which allows high speed, longer message size, and more

Art Unit: 2665

data (See Fig. 3, Col. 6, lines 50-53). Therefore, examiner maintains that the references cited and applied in the last office actions for the rejection of the claims 7, 10 are maintained in this office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 7-8 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christie et al. (US#5,926,482) in view of Clarke et al. (US#5,550,914).

With respect to claim 7, Christie discloses an enhanced signal transfer point (STP) applies message transfer part (MTP) functions to signaling message that contain point codes. A signaling system in accordance with the present invention comprising first and second signaling point codes, wherein the second point code is used to identify functions and MTP users (See Figs. 4-6, Col. 4, lines 8-29). Christie further teaches in Fig. 3 an SS7 broadband message functionality in which the same MTP network handles the physical/ electrical transport of signaling messages on the same individual links (Col. 6, lines 49-56).

Art Unit: 2665

However, Christie does not expressly disclose wherein the second point code is used to make full use of the longer and unsegmented message length. In the same field of endeavor, Clarke et al. teaches in Fig. 3 illustrated the general form of a signal unit used for transferring information across links in an SS7 network in which the MSU carry all service/application data sent on the SS7 network is up to 273 octets maximum (Col. 6, lines 50-53). SS7 was developed to allow high-speed communications between telephone exchanges before and during call setup, and one of the primary characteristics of broadband SS7 message is the longer message size, allowing more of data.

Regarding claim 10, this claim differs from the claim above in that the point codes being part of different MTP networks but not the same MTP networks. However, Christie further discloses in Fig. 2 a basic relationship of a telecommunications network including a signaling system that is linked to signaling point in other network elements. Other types of signaling points are equally applicable to the present invention. For example, the above referenced signaling processors can function as signaling points. In addition, other signaling systems, such as C7 signaling, are equally applicable to the present invention (Col. 5, lines 51-60).

Regarding claims 8 and 11, Christie discloses the MTP routing tables supporting the enhanced links, wherein the routing tables are structured such that routing between nodes with the second point code uses only the enhanced link (Fig. 5; Col. 8, lines 21-30).

One skilled in the art would have recognized the need for effectively and efficiently transferring message using the signaling point codes in the broadband telecommunications system, and would have applied Clarke' novel use of the signal unit used for transferring information

Art Unit: 2665

across links in an SS7 network into Christie's teaching of the enhanced signal transfer point which alters the point codes in telecommunications signaling. Therefore, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to apply Clarke's communications signaling network apparatus into Christie's telecommunications apparatus, system, and method with an enhanced signal transfer point with the motivation being to provide a node which supports enhanced links for transferring longer messages than according to current MTP level 2.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 9 and 12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

7. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The prior art of record fails to disclose or suggest wherein the primary translation is to be logical destinations reachable via the enhanced links and backup translation is to logical destination reachable via links based on MTP level 2 if translation results in a physical destination located in a node supporting the enhanced links, as specifically recited in claims 9 and 12.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2665

The Grier (US#5,615,213) is cited to show the message transmission using out-of-band signaling channel.

The Angenot et al. (US#5,650,998) is cited to show the method for reassigning traffic in a common channel signaling system (SS7).

The He et al. (US#5,799,317) is cited to show the data management system for a telecommunications signaling system (SS7).


9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Mphan

09/25/2002

mp


HUY D. VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600